UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Short-Cuts to Carnage - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

Let's Build a Bridge - - *Raymond C. Rode*

When Having Makes Have-Nots - *Leo Hirsch*

Unity Begins at Home - *G. Bromley Oxnam*

Curious Arguments for Immortality - - - - - - - - - *Victor S. Yarros*

A Doubting Mind Is a Healthy One - - - - - - - - - *Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.*

Want Is the Foe - - - *Herbert Sturges*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXII NUMBER 6

Chicago, August, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 15 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Stanton A. Coblentz: Well-known journalist and author.

Donald Harrington: Associate Minister of The Community Church, New York City.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Jack Mendelsohn, Jr.: Minister of The Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian), Rockford, Illinois.

G. Bromley Oxnam: Bishop of the Methodist Church, New York Area.

Raymond C. Rode: Major in Business Administration in the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Herbert Sturges: Teacher in the Cibecue Day School, Cibecue, Arizona.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Palestine—CURTIS W. REESE 83

ARTICLES—
Short-Cuts to Carnage—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 84
Let's Build a Bridge—RAYMOND C. RODE 85
When Having Makes Have-Nots—LEO HIRSCH 86
Unity Begins at Home—G. BROMLEY OXNAM 89
Curious Arguments for Immortality—VICTOR S. YARROS 89
A Doubting Mind Is a Healthy One—JACK MENDELSOHN, JR. 92
Want Is the Foe—HERBERT STURGES 93

POETRY—
The Fall of Man?—MANFRED A. CARTER 88

THE STUDY TABLE—
Behind the Iron Curtain—DONALD HARRINGTON 94

CORRESPONDENCE—
Agrees with Chworowsky—CHARLES E. GEIGER 94
Differs from Chworowsky—EDMUND A. OPITZ 94
Courageous Articles—EDITH HANSEN 95
Advance—STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN 95
A Thoughtful Response—CHARLES G. GIRELIUS 95
Approval—JAMES A. MEADE 95

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 96

THE FIELD—
General MacArthur Speaks—*Fellowship* 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

General MacArthur Speaks

The following remarkable excerpts are taken verbatim from the address of General Douglas MacArthur before the opening session of the Allied Control Council in Tokyo, Japan, on April 4, 1946.

While all the provisions of this proposed new [Japanese] Constitution are of importance, and lead individually and collectively to the desired end as expressed at Potsdam, I desire especially to mention that provision dealing with the renunciation of war. Such renunciation, while in some respects a logical sequence to the destruction of Japan's war-making potential, goes yet further in *the surrender of the sovereign right to resort to arms* in the international sphere.

Japan thereby proclaims her faith in a society of nations, governed by just, tolerant, and effective rules of universal social and political morality, and entrusts its national sovereignty thereto.

The cynic may view such action as demonstrating but a childlike faith in a visionary ideal, but the *realist* will see in it far deeper significance.

He will understand that in the evolution of society it became necessary for man to surrender certain rights theretofore inherent in himself in order that states might be created vested with sovereign power over the individuals who collectively formed them—that foremost of these inherent rights thus surrendered to the body politic was man's right to resort to force in the settlement of disputes with his neighbor.

With the advance of society, groups or states federated together through the identical process of surrendering inherent rights and submitting to a sovereign power representing the collective will. In such a manner was formed the United States of America. . . .

The proposal of the Japanese government—a government over people who now have reason to know the complete failure of war as an instrument of national policy—in effect but recognizes one further step in the evolution of mankind, under which nations would develop, for mutual protection against war, yet a higher law of international, social, and political morality.

Whether the world is yet ready for so forward a step in the relations between nations, or whether another and totally destructive war—a war involving *almost mass extermination*—must first be waged, is the great issue which now confronts all peoples.

There can be no doubt that both the progress and survival of civilization is dependent upon the timely recognition of the imperative need for some such forward step; is dependent upon the realization by all nations of the *utter futility of force as an arbiter of international issues;* is dependent upon elimination from inter-

(*Continued on page* 91)

UNITY

Volume CXXXII AUGUST, 1946 No. 6

PALESTINE

Holy but unhappy Palestine is the spiritual homeland of Jews, Christians, and Moslems. It belongs to the traditions of all of them, and it should never become the exclusive possession of any one of them. A Jewish National State in Palestine, which would be historically anachronistic and currently undemocratic, is not in the international cards, and agitation for it is futile. Partition would be unworkable and unjust. And autonomy is impossible. It is a pity that three great religions cannot voluntarily work out a plan for the peaceful development of Palestine as a world center of religious culture. But since they are unable to do this, then in the interest of the peace of the world the secular states should agree on a plan for internationalization of control and over-all policy, involving physical development and guaranteed protection against external aggression and internal strife. Within this framework Jews, Christians, and Moslems should be encouraged and helped to build up in Palestine outstanding centers of culture and learning, such as libraries, universities, and theological schools where scholars and students would gather from all the world. Such centers, representing three great ethnic religions, plus the secular cultural centers that would inevitably accompany international control and development of the land, would bring into close contact many streams of tradition and learning and be of inestimable value in fostering understanding and in developing unity on a world scale. In this way Palestine could be converted from a country of internal hatred and external intrigue into a country befitting its designation as the Holy Land.

Curtis W. Reese.

Short-Cuts to Carnage

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

There is a point of view which one hears frequently advanced nowadays, and which is dangerous not only in the shallowness of its optimism, but in the wall of complacency which it tends to establish in the way of permanent peace.

"None of the great nations today desire or require war," we are told by the man on the street, by the radio news commentator, and from the pages of the press. "Russia needs a long period of recuperation from the wounds of the last war; Great Britain is in an even more sorry pass; while there is nothing which the United States seeks less than another conflict, and nothing which would do greater damage to our economy. Hence you may be sure that all this war talk is only talk."

Unfortunately, such reasoning does not bear analysis. It is built upon two major fallacies, either of which would suffice to invalidate it. In the first place, the assumption is that nations fight only when they desire or require war—a theory combatted by every bit of international knowledge which we have been painfully accumulating ever since 1914. Did Belgium, or for that matter France or England or the United States, desire or require the first World War? Did Norway or Greece or Poland or Russia or our own country desire or require the recent conflict? If any fact at all be obvious, it is that war played havoc with the economy of every land; that it ripped and tore the aggressors fully as much as it did their intended victims; and that, while it unquestionably *was* desired by small predatory groups in certain countries, the people did not anywhere prefer it to peace, but submitted to it with the docility of cattle being driven to the slaughter. War definitely was not desired—not by the great majority; and yet war came. And war definitely was not required—not for any end that could not have been more successfully consummated by peaceful arrangements before the first trigger was pressed. Yet war broke out. What guaranty therefore have we that it will not break out again even though not desired or required—even though the people go forth with torment on their faces to meet the rocket bombs and the atomic raiders, and though the still unhealed injuries of the last war give way to the even ghastlier wounds of the next?

No, if wars occurred only when desired or required by the peoples as a whole, the twentieth century would have been ruled by the mythical white Prince of Peace.

Even more fundamental is the second fallacy of analysts of the current scene. They speak of nations as of units governed by unerringly wise rulers, who will inevitably do what is of advantage to those units—just as if anything could have been more to the disadvantage of Germany, Italy, Japan, and several other countries than the warlike actions of their late leaders. And they forget that what is favored by the civilian heads is not necessarily approved by the military chieftains; and that when any great country has emerged triumphantly from a warlike effort, the military chieftains will have been enhanced enormously in power, and may exert themselves to the detriment of civilian interests. We have observed this tendency in the United States both before and since V-J Day: in the military drive for a peacetime conscription that would alter our fundamental institutions; in the large-army and large-navy demands that, if granted, must vitally affect our foreign policy, and bring other nations into a race of armaments; in the actual military manipulation of foreign policy in China, and in the half-veiled antagonism toward Russia; in the naval atomic bomb tests, apparently planned in accordance with the callous old principle that "the end justifies the means" and without regard to the resultant worldwide dread of the United States; and, most of all, in the army's attitude toward the atomic bomb, and its insistence upon legislation that, if passed, would not only have been a constricting band about the throat of scientific freedom, but would have represented the most undemocratic measure ever taken in the land that allegedly fought to "make the world safe for democracy."

Let us understand this fact clearly: the aims and interests of military leaders are not necessarily those of the masses. The military leaders represent a caste apart: their profession is to fight; they see the world through the eyes of fighters, and consequently are subject to distortions not possible to the most irrational of non-fighting men. Does it matter to them that a country has been bled almost white from the last war, and may be ruined irretrievably by the next? Do they take into consideration the intricate ramifications of the civilian economy, and remember that these and not warlike developments are of first importance? That these and not warlike developments are normal and desirable? Even though, by their own lights, they be loyal and patriotic men, they cannot help looking upon repressive laws and piled-up armies and armaments with a blurring perspective: these, to their minds, may be indispensable safeguards, when in civilian eyes they are mere provocations to combat. And, in the same way, they do not and cannot look upon the actual conflict as do civilians—not that ordinarily they deliberately court war, but that war for them may have attractions it does not possess for the majority, and that to them the process of sabre-rattling may appear justifiable when for the ordinary citizen it is a horror to be eschewed like the plague.

What, then, can we expect if military forces, following a great war, gain the ascendancy in the government? Must we conclude that, simply because the country does not need or seek war, war will not come? —that the necessity of repairing economic losses or the loathing of the majority for the battlefield will unfailingly prevent a holocaust? The situation becomes even more questionable when a war ends with the extraordinary world alignment observable on V-J Day; when two enormously powerful nations, such as the United States and Russia, have both emerged victorious after a tremendous effort in which they had only temporarily submerged their mutual suspicions and misunderstandings. Here we find that, with the re-emergence of those suspicions and misunderstandings, and with the swagger of triumph that tends to appear in the movements of successful military leaders everywhere, a danger not at all related to the desires or requirements of the people may grow to storm-proportions.

This may be true even if there be no direct conflict of economic interests between the two nations (though a conflict could conceivably arise were the "life line" of the British Empire to be threatened, and were we to espouse the British cause). Wars—as analyses of Hitler's and Mussolini's various invasions will show—

do not necessarily spring from economic roots, but from tensions which may be economic in origin, or may be psychologically induced, as were the late Fuehrer's assaults upon Czechoslovakia, Poland, and other nations. It may be stated as a general rule that whenever any tension reaches the breaking point—though it be economic or psychological in its basis—war is to be expected. And it is precisely here that the peril rests. Dominance of military leaders and of military moods, without regard to the wishes or necessities of the people, may cause a dangerous psychological tension not only in the United States but in her chief potential rival. In the course of time this tension may grow, unnoticeably but powerfully; until in the end, unexpectedly, like a rubber band that has been stretched too far, it may snap—exposing the world to new catastrophe.

What, then, is the remedy? First of all, in a realization of the possibilities; in a refutation of all glib, complacent statements to the effect that war will not occur because the people of no nation desire or require it. And, secondly, we must work deliberately to lessen the tensions: to see that the military authorities and the military way of thinking do not dominate; to attempt, by interchanges of information, travelers and students, to combat suspicion and misunderstanding with sympathy and enlightenment; and, above all, to take care that the United Nations organization becomes an actual, working means of bringing the nations together. War should not occur; war need not occur; war *must* not occur; the world cannot afford war. But war can occur, regardless of the necessities and the common sense of the matter. If we will courageously recognize this truth, and, having recognized it, will go forth with open eyes to meet the danger, we will have a far better chance of a peaceful future than if we doze in the somnolent assurance that war will keep away for the reason that no visitor could be more unwelcome.

Let's Build a Bridge

RAYMOND C. RODE

A young Jewish boy was walking down a pleasant lane on the outskirts of Warsaw, Poland, about fifty years ago. Suddenly he was surrounded by a gang of boys who seized him, pinned him roughly to the ground, and shouted, "Did you murder Christ?"

The boy's name was Sholem Asch, the same Sholem Asch who wrote the best seller, *The Apostle,* and other great works on the beginnings of Christianity, including *The Nazarene.* The gang was made up of Christian boys caught with the fervor of the Passion Week holidays. Relations between the Jews and Christians of Warsaw in those days were reasonably good within the city limits, but beyond the Christians were supreme. During most of the year there was amity between the people of the two faiths but towards the end of Lent no Jew hardly dared to show his face out of doors.

Thus Sholem Asch spent his childhood. Was he embittered by these experiences? On the contrary, he developed a deep appreciation for all Christendom. Although he first came to know Christianity not through love, but through fear and terror, he has constantly tried to understand the reasons for the wide chasm between the two faiths and to build a bridge across it on the foundation of mutual understanding of their common heritage. In his work, *The Apostle,* he interprets Christianity as one of the finest steps in Jewish religious development.

What caused this wide schism that Mr. Asch constantly seeks to bridge? History shows that the early Christian church was barely distinguishable from the rest of Jewry. All of its members were Jews, the Gentiles spoken of in the New Testament being Judaized pagans. They continued their worship in the Temple of Jerusalem. They followed the Law of Moses in abstaining from the meat of unclean animals and in the keeping of the Sabbath.

It is also wise to remind ourselves always that Jesus himself was a Jew and not a Christian. He came not to establish a new religion but to strengthen an old one. He kept all of the Jewish laws. He quoted the old Jewish prophets. The "stiff-necked" people he spoke of were the sect of the Sadducees, who had broken away from the basic tenets of the Jewish faith to the extent of denying even a life after death.

Why, then, was this group of Jewish Messianists, who believed that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah all Jews had been waiting for, cut off from the rest of Jewry as a new-born child is cut from his mother? Was it because blame for Jesus' death was placed on Israel?

It is hardly fair to hold historic Jewry and the Jews of today responsible for the murder of Jesus committed by certain irresponsible elements in Judaism in that day who were prodded by the cruel Roman procurator, Pilate. It is like condemning all of Catholicism because an Alexander VI or a Paul IV usurped Peter's chair in Rome.

Only at the order of Pilate did the tyrannical high priests dare to try Jesus as they did. As mere Jews they would not have dared to hold a trial on the eve of a Sabbath. Also, trials at night were expressly forbidden by Jewish law. This law, in addition, provided for forty days between arrest and trial in which the defendant could prepare his case. But the Roman procurator feared the consequences of allowing an agitator to be at large at this festival time when the city of Jerusalem was jammed with celebrants who only the week before followed this Jesus into the Temple and proclaimed him the King of the Jews.

When Pilate's legionnaires brought Jesus to him, he discovered to his chagrin that Jesus had not committed treason against Ceasar, the only crime punishable by crucifixion. So Pilate had to have Jesus tried by the Jewish court. This he ordered done immediately even if all Jewish laws had to be ignored.

This Jewish court was made up of corrupt high priests or former high priests of the Sadducean sect, all of whom purchased their tenure in office at a huge price. It was hastily and secretly called together in the home of the high priest. Thus it was not difficult to omit notifying anyone who would not agree to the desired decision.

Jesus was found guilty of blasphemy against God.

But the court did not dare sentence him to the Jewish execution of stoning.

They sent him back to Pilate.

Pilate of course knew that Jesus was innocent of treason against Ceasar. But by cowardly machinations of ridicule and trickery he convinced the biased Jewish mob to choose Barabbas to be released.

Thus it is quite clear that the Romans killed Jesus. Tacitus, the Roman historian, says simply and innocently: "Christ was executed as a criminal."

The Sadducean sect was obliterated when the Temple of Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans. It did not truly represent Jewry of that day. Its corrupt high priests were despised by the people. The Jews that perpetuated Judaism after the destruction of the Temple were those who interpreted the great voluminous Torah of Moses as "love thy neighbor."

So let us follow the example of Sholem Asch in uncovering and accepting the facts of the mutual foundations, beliefs, and aspirations of the two faiths. His two works, *The Apostle* and *The Nazarene,* provide an ample number of these facts. They could well be our handbook for National Brotherhood Week or the fifty-one other weeks. This great mediator has done much to build the bridge between the two faiths on the twin pillars of love of God and love of man. It is conceivable that a reader of these two works could be repelled by both faiths, but no man could read them and rationally attempt to combine loyalty to Christendom with repugnance toward Israel.

When Having Makes Have-Nots

LEO HIRSCH

Beyond doubt, the greatest threat to the political, economic, and religious life of our day is the mass worship of property. Whether it is the aristocratic landowner whose income comes to him without effort, in accordance with immemorial custom, or the businessman engaged in the conscious pursuit of wealth, or the countless men without property who learn to hate and envy the propertied, all worship at the same shrine of ownership and love of power.

To break down this ancient grip on man's conscience, the bottleneck in man's spiritual development, there is an imperative need for rethinking and reinterpretation of ownership and property rights. An ethical code capable of dealing effectively with men intoxicated with the heady power of property is the pressing task of our times. Property must be turned to serving social ends, rather than allow it to remain an end in itself.

In the past, inequality between classes based on property was looked upon as fundamental in the social structure, and so no one challenged it. Those who willingly or unwillingly suffered under the system were told to expect their reward in heaven. In this way religion attempted to uphold the unjust social order, distracting men's minds by talking of existence in the next world.

Organized religion has also preached the doctrine of trusteeship, that the rich man is a kind of trustee for the poor, that the landlord holds his land in trust for his tenant. This has frequently been the Church's way of explaining property and property rights.

Starting in the Renaissance, these well-defended ideas began to be vulnerable, and by the second half of the seventeenth century John Locke wrote that every man has private property in the produce of his labor, or at least should have. In pre-industrial days this maxim was not so unrealistic as it has since become.

The revolutionary doctrine that the value of a product depends upon the labor expended upon it has been variously attributed to Ricardo and to Karl Marx, but is found in Locke as well as in a long line of predecessors stretching back to Aquinas. Locke claimed that nine-tenths of value is due to labor, that it is labor which puts the difference in value on everything.

Unfortunately, fair as it may be, the principle that a man has a right to the product of his own labor is useless in today's complex industrial setup. Suppose that an individual works at one machine operation in the manufacture of General Motors cars. How can any cost accountant, even the cleverest, estimate what proportion of the total output is due to that particular worker's labor? It is simply impossible.

The final industrial product is like a bridge cable composed of a great many wire strands tightly interwoven and inseparable. The finished product is the coöperative creation of innumerable individuals, both hand and brain workers. And so, inherited ideas of compensation for work must be completely revised and based on a wage that will enable the worker to do a job in the most efficient manner. Modern industry is a complex coöperative undertaking and should yield the worker an assured security and enough pay to encourage the best work. The egocentric outlook of the managers of industry must give way to a sociocentric way of life.

The craving for wealth must be as old as human nature. The instinct to acquire property and defend it against all comers regardless of right, the acquisitive instinct, is as primeval as hunger and lust, and is indeed itself a kind of hunger and lust. Property probably originated at the moment when, on the basis of the division of labor, tribal society disintegrated and placed separate groups of society in varying relations to the means of production.

From then on, the strong, shrewd individuals appropriated parts of the public means of production and changed them into private property. It was at this juncture that the oppression, the suffering, and the privations, from which the human race has suffered ever since, were created and developed. From that time on, the exploitation of one class by another took place.

Men, ever since they were created, have yearned to stand out among their fellows, if only on the basis of things they own. The good opinion of one's fellows is necessary in order to make life tolerable. Distinction means difference, and distinction in property implies ownership of things which the common man does not have.

Property which satisfies a personal craving is one

form of wealth. Another type consists of objects which are of no use directly in satisfying personal desires and appetities, or at least are not actually so used, but are valuable because they are the means of creating those goods which give pleasure and satisfaction. The outstanding form of this kind of wealth is land.

In the large sense, land is the final, universal, and indispensable source of all material things. It is the reservoir of mineral wealth and the storehouse of food supplies. From land only can men derive the essentials for livelihood and comfort. Consequently, land has always been and still is the basic and most important form of property. Small wonder that for thousands of years men have fought and died, cheated and killed for land.

Anthropologists tell us that pristine man never thought of land in terms of ownership at all. It was the introduction of private ownership of land which marked the initiation of a special class of rich individuals who have enjoyed a position of privilege ever since. For ages the surest way to be rich has been to own land, and since land is one of the most durable forms of property, the landlord class has tended to have more hereditary stability than any other group of plutocrats.

One of the supremely revealing books of the nineteenth century is Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*. In it George recognizes that land is an instrument of exploitation and shows clearly the menace of land monopoly to the spiritual progress of the nation. He led the assault upon land monopolists and tried to give the American people the solution to the paradoxical quality of land ownership which produces poverty in the midst of abundance. The value of land, Henry George recognized, was created not by any one man but by society; "the value of land increases with the growth of society," and being created by society, should belong to it.

Land is an ancient form of property, and the development of capitalism and the corporation brought about an entirely new era of wealth. Around the machine—the core of capitalism—have been built factories, railroads, steamships, department stores, public utilities, and industrial banks with their enormous credit. The characteristic items of wealth in the modern world are the instruments of capitalism, and the would-be rich strive primarily for the possession of these in quantity.

For many purposes land and capital may be treated alike, but in some ways capital differs from land. Wealth today is money in the bank and back of it the organized instruments of economic production which are supposed to provide the money. Paper instruments, called interest-bearing securities, are used to promote and permit the circulation of economic energy, and these always bear interest and are always personally owned.

Slowly and ever so reluctantly we are beginning to realize that if the common man is to participate in the operation of the new business mechanism and play his part in supporting the wealth of the rich, he too must have a money income, and that the larger his wage the more effectively can he support the market upon which prosperity depends. Plainly, the implication is that modern wealth must be social, that riches must be shared, if it is to exist.

Naturally, sharing is the very antithesis of the traditional concept of wealth. Historically, the essence of wealth is exclusiveness, and though the danger warnings against this view have been given long ago, the concentration of wealth and income in fewer and yet fewer hands goes heedlessly on, bringing ever nearer the day of collapse and explosion.

The need for a radical transformation of the system of property and property rights is clear. With present-day advanced technological equipment methods could be devised for creating a world in which men may have friendly feelings toward other men. It is our duty to put forth efforts to achieve this goal and thereby save our democratic way of life.

We have reached a stage in our civilization when action becomes imperative. What can we do about directing our society toward a more equitable distribution of wealth? Are we so strongly committed to democracy that we stand ready, as we should be, to democratize property? If we are to live the ethical life, we must see our interests in the light of the larger interests of all. We must change our traditional ideas and surrender old-fangled beliefs in the sacredness of private monopoly.

Monopoly capitalism is hindering our nation at every turn from being a democratic society and is forcing us to uphold a rickety structure of privileged and underprivileged. Are we ready, as we ought to be, to abolish both monopoly capitalism and privilege? Property is social in origin, and it ought to be social in intent and application.

With regard to the individual and society, two kinds of property are distinguishable. There is, to begin with, private property which an individual may claim as belonging to him and to those who immediately depend upon him. Secondly, there is public or social property, which rightly belongs to every human being on earth and which may be shared with everyone.

The food we consume, the clothes we wear, the homes we live in, and the furniture in these homes may be included under private property. These things are private possessions under any arrangement of society, capitalistic, socialistic, or communistic. Private property includes what is needed for the maintenance of the home and whatever else is needed for security against sickness, unemployment, and old age. Under any arrangement of society, therefore, private property will never disappear. On the contrary, individual property must be maintained and universally recognized as an instrument to develop personality.

The other type of property is that which ought to be shared by all men. This includes land, the minerals and natural resources, all sources of water power, all electrical energy, atomic energy, primary means of commercialized transportation, chief means of commercialized communication, banking and credit, and the basic steel industry.

Socialized ownership and operation of these must replace private ownership. What is more, all other essential industries now in private hands ought to be subjected to public regulation required in the public interest. Public operation of the second type of property would make possible the proper balance between national saving and national spending, and would thereby stabilize industry and regularize income, making possible the utilization of total production with industrial equipment and technological knowledge.

Proper utilization of our national resources and our national credit would not only provide work for everybody, but would immeasurably raise the standard of living. By curbing uncontrolled license of individualism and by seeking through collectivism in the basic industries mutual prosperity and security, a far nobler freedom could be achieved. Ultra-conservatives may fear coöperation, but our greatest achievements in civilization have come through collective action: the building of cities, the creation of the state and the nation. Right now coöperative action is trying to organize a world government or federation of commonwealths through the United Nations.

On public highways drivers obey the rules of traffic and follow the directions of the red and green signals. Without coöperative observance of rules there would be only chaos and death. By coöperation we learn to devote all our talents and services to the nation and to our fellow men. Now our supreme challenge is to free by means of coöperation the full development of atomic energy and to prevent its getting into the maw of private monopoly enterprise.

The transfer of private property in the basic industries to public ownership must be made by purchase and not by confiscation. The constitutional right of eminent domain may be applied, and the private ownership compensated by a just price. England's Labor government is taking the lead and showing us the way in socializing her public property, and she is doing so gradually and sanely. It is my conviction that in our own country, as in England, the basic industries will be socialized by Federal legislation, authorizing their purchase and creating instruments for their operations. If the workers, consumers, and voters can be educated and organized on a sufficiently powerful basis in favor of a program of socialization, then the change can be ushered in peacefully and democratically as it was in England.

To open the way of intelligent political action to the American public, there is overwhelming need of an aggressive National Labor Party, defiantly committed to the substitution of the paramount rights of the workers for the present supremacy of the rights of property and profits. Due to the present coalition of the economic Bourbons of the Republican Party and the economic Bourbons of the Democratic Party who are determined to prevent the passage of all needed social legislation, there is a genuine possibility that a new political alignment can be brought about to form this National Labor Party that would devote its time and energy to education and organization for the socialization of the basic industries and the breaking up of the present status quo.

The purpose of democratizing industry and property is not merely to protect the worker against exploitation, but primarily to release in him his creative faculty. Its ethical goal is not only to improve human conditions, but also to improve human nature itself.

To support and elevate human life is the sole object of all wholesome economic effort. Any devotion of effort other than to that purpose, among an industrial or commercial people, is wanton waste of energy, whatever may be its solemn sanction by law or tradition, or its apparent pecuniary profitableness. To make human relationships just and efficient is the purpose of democracy. It is by this purpose that economic institutions and economic effort must be identified, and accordingly encouraged or abolished.

The true function of business is to utilize the contributions of technology in the production of goods and services and in the distribution of these among the entire population in such quantities and proportions as will promote the maximum efficiency, morality, and happiness of all. So interpreted, modern business must confess complete inefficiency and failure.

That modern business is efficient is a pervasive myth. The first purpose of business is to make money, not to render service or develop fine human relations. A business system, furthermore, based on the assumption of a competitive, individualistic economy, and predicated on scarcity, cannot possibly be efficient in a civilization which demands coöperation, interdependence, and world integration, and in which abundance is a potential reality.

In the atomic era nations must bid farewell to the exclusive, monopolistic, competitive concept of property, and adopt in its place the ethical idea of maximum communal well-being. Tacitus, in his history of the Roman emperors, gives perfect case studies of the principle that no human being, however good, wise, or judicious, can wield uncontrolled, unlimited, irresponsible power without becoming arbitrary, cruel, and inhuman.

Today, managerial power, achieved through legal trickery, usurpation, and the indifference of stockholders, is independent of, uncontrolled by, and not responsible to the shareholders. All public property must be removed from the grip of corporate management, so as to give human rights precedence over property rights.

Only through the socialization of all public property can society supply a social function to every individual, and a common social purpose to mankind. Without coöperative administration of the natural resources and basic industries, there can be no lasting peace, no improvement of the social order, no real progress.

Man has the two-fold task of conquering and harnessing the forces of nature, and perfecting himself so as to enable him to create a civilization in which justice, truth, and righteousness shall prevail. Our obsolete system of property and property right is at bottom the cause of ruthless materialism and immorality, and has created a society in which the majority must suffer in order that few may prosper. Mankind must take a new direction, conquer limitations and weaknesses, and rise to a nobler destiny.

The Fall of Man?

Grim preachers prophesy the fall of man—
That cities melt before the breath of doom,
That we have failed to build our peaceful plan
Until the future takes its standing room;
I would not dig beneath the earth to die,
Nor run into the hills with screaming slaves,
If there were bursting stars across the sky . . .
There is no shield nor shelter now in caves.

But I am sure that youth will always rise
From lonely forests by the seven seas;
And these will see the world with clearer eyes
To fly their dreams upon the morning breeze.
The old men stand on crowded streets, still blind
But unafraid—for sudden death is kind.

MANFRED A. CARTER.

Unity Begins at Home

G. BROMLEY OXNAM

We are told that charity begins at home. Let me alter that truism to a more timely one—unity begins at home. Since the day we sought, fought for, and gained our independence, unity has been the basis of our American strength. It was incorporated in our very name.

It is fitting, therefore, that there should now be convened in the United States a great assemblage of freemen working to solve, in international terms, the everyday problems of human relationships. With this gathering of the United Nations, we see world unity beginning at home—our home.

No more appropriate site could be chosen. For this country of ours is a vast laboratory where many varied groups of people have experimented in the science of human relationships. In successfully cultivating that science, we have proved that people of different races and creeds can live and work together in peace. We have proved that a people devoted to freedom will invariably triumph over the forces of disunity.

We have had many such triumphs in the past. The Know-Nothing Party, the Black Legion, the Ku Klux Klan, the Christian Front—many such ugly movements, trading on racial and religious bigotry, have tried to make headway among us. But Americans have always risen to defeat them. Having reared a great democracy upon the Brotherhood of Man, we are quick to recognize the hallmark of tyranny—the base appeal to turn against our neighbor and trespass on his rights.

Respect for human rights is embodied in our Constitution, affirmed in our courts, and nourished in our schools. Flowering in the boundless energy and talents of our people, weathering the storms of depression and war, our belief in the sanctity of the individual has proved the bulwark of security for all Americans.

The United Nations is now dedicated to that belief. For, on this closely knit globe, peace is transient and tottering unless we succeed in protecting the individual human rights of people everywhere. In asserting "the dignity and worth of the human person" and "the equal rights of men and women of nations large and small," the United Nations Charter stands solidly upon the basic precepts of religion, set forth by the prophets of Judaism and Christianity alike; tried, tested and defended by generations of Americans.

The full measure of our support goes to the men and women now gathered here to translate these ideals into action. The opening of the General Assembly of the United Nations, scheduled for September 3 in New York, will launch a nationwide observance of United Nations Week. Schools, churches, clubs, community centers, newspapers, radios—all will participate. United Nations Week will have the backing and active coöperation of every man, woman, and child from coast to coast, in a demonstration of unity unparalleled in this country.

Yes, the foundations for one world are being laid in the United States. World unity is beginning here—at home. But it is in the homes and communites of each one of us that the impetus to solve the tough, everyday human problems of living together has its origin. It is there that liberty of conscience and recognition of the dignity of man find their first roots. It is there that the men and women of good will, delegates of the fifty-one United Nations, will find their inspiration.

Curious Arguments for Immortality

VICTOR S. YARROS

I have been reading, or rereading, certain books and lectures on the question of immortality, survival of the human individual after death. Of course, millions of uneducated and credulous persons still believe in such immortality, but this fact is without significance. Science and philosophy take no account of superstition and ignorance. But when cultivated, trained, able men and women who think, and know what thinking means, assure us that *they* believe in immortality, we are bound —even if we are convinced, unterrified Agnostics—to ask ourselves what explanation there is at this late day for the belief in question. In other words, what is the argument by which real and learned thinkers support their belief in immortality?

In this article, I propose to examine the argument for immortality by several writers of note and standing —Principal L. P. Jacks, the editor of *Hibbert's Magazine;* the late Paul Elmer More, the colleague, in the humanitarian movement, of the late Prof. Irving Babbitt; Prof. W. E. Hocking, Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, and Prof. J. P. Williams. If we find that the arguments advanced by such scholars and progressive thinkers as these are not only inconclusive, but wholly unscientific, woefully inadequate, astonishingly weak and superficial, we shall be justified in deciding that immortality cannot be proved or even made plausible to the satisfaction of any thoughtful, clear-headed and logical person.

This, I may as well say here, is precisely the decision we shall have to reach. Principal Jacks, whose books and lectures are profitable and rewarding, and who is a liberal and progressive educator, tells us that he believes in immortality for the following reasons: Only two doctrines are possible as to the nature of the universe, one holding it to be dead, lifeless, a mechanism going by a kind of clockwork, and the other holding it to be essentially alive, as we are, conscious of itself as a unitary whole. The saying of the Gospel, God is not a God of the dead, but of the living, covers everything in space and time—all is alive, and it is one life, plainly an immortal life, that animates the whole. If we are at one with the universe, we become sharers in its immortality. Life and immortality are the keywords of the real universe and the keywords to our own reality, because we are the sons of the universe. We are the fellow workers of the Great Companion, the Soul

of the world. Our purpose, then, is the creation of value. We are here to add value to the world. This we do by treating all men as ends in themselves, and not as means. Now, if we are all extinguished at death, then the universe does not treat us as ends. It is unjust to us, whereas the great Soul of the universe is just. The great and wise men we honor *cannot* be dead. The great Soul, or God, surely looks after them and preserves them, and it will preserve and look after all good and just men. The belief in immortality is thus bound up with the belief in God.

This position is not markedly different from that of Professor Hocking, who makes a distinction between immortality and immortability. In the latter he believes, in the former he scarcely does. Immortality must, according to him, be achieved by a worthy and noble life. The majority of men are *not* immortal; the minority *are,* and deserve to be!

Professor More believes that *all* human beings are immortal, since nature is just and since our mind and heart assure us of immortality. God is incapable of cheating us, of playing tricks with us, or making promises and failing to redeem them. Our belief in immortality is therefore sufficient proof of the existence of immortality.

Now, let us consider the arguments thus briefly summarized, with candor and sympathy. In the first place, is it true that men believe in immortality intuitively? The answer is "No." Many thinkers have no such intuition, no such belief. The arguments for immortality found in books do not convince them. Even those who believe in God do not necessarily believe in immortality. Justice is a human conception, and it is sheer presumption to assume that God, if he exists, shares our notion of justice. What his notion may be, we cannot possibly imagine. The finite mind cannot grasp the thoughts of the Infinite.

If many enlightened and earnest men do not believe in immortality, where is the "cheating" and the "injustice" Professor More spoke of in case we reject the idea of immortality? If hosts of educated men are not sure of immortality—and this is undoubtedly the case—again, where is the deception or the trick in question?

Moreover, intuitions are often wrong, and to complain of cheating or trickery seems rather childish. We should teach men to put no blind trust in their intuitions, and to cherish no illusions. We are, of course, allowed by the spirit and method of science to frame hypotheses, but we must never forget that hypotheses are not final explanations of phenomena. And a theory is always subject to revision, correction, or rejection in the light of new evidence. Immortality may be a sort of hypothesis, but it is not an accepted scientific hypothesis, and it certainly has not been proved valid by the proper methods of science. The tendency of most men of science is to reject it on grounds of common sense and human probability.

As for the argument that great, wise and good men deserve immortality, it is incumbent on those who advance it to tell us what their real notion of immortality is. The body, we know, is buried or cremated after death. Physical resurrection of the body we bury, to be attacked by worms and gradually consumed, is simply unthinkable. Immortality for what men have called the soul, or the spirit, is not in itself an absurd idea, provided we know what we mean by the soul or spirit. Does the soul leave the body at or after death, and live on in some other form? If so, where does it dwell? Not on the suns, or stars, surely. Where, then? In space, which seems to us empty? Do disembodied spirits float in this space endlessly? If they do, to what purpose? What possible function is theirs? If they do nothing at all, what is the value of immortality to them? What does Principal Jacks mean when he tells us that he is disposed to believe that God looks after the wise and great men and preserves them? To look after, in the human sense of the phrase, is to provide something, to serve, to protect, and to foster. What kind of service do disembodied souls require, and what protection do they need or ask?

It seems foolish to put such questions as these, but the human mind cannot help thinking precisely in these simple terms, and to say that these terms are irrelevant and inapplicable to disembodied souls is to admit, tacitly, that the very idea of a disembodied soul is a pseud-idea, in Spencer's words. It is actually devoid of any meaning. All the talk throughout the ages about the immortality of our souls, or spirits, has been devoid of human meaning. No one can imagine the life of a disembodied soul. If they have neither work nor recreation, in our sense of these terms, what sort of existence do they lead? Surely we cannot imagine Beethoven composing and conducting symphonies before ghostly audiences and employing ghostly instruments. And is Shakespeare writing and producing plays? Is Newton studying Relativity and quantum physics and correcting his own ideas? Is Euclid busy reading the scientific books of the non-Euclidian geometricians?

Again, such questions seem naive, but one cannot help asking them. The philosophers and metaphysicians refrain from asking them, but the philosophy and metaphysics that are not rooted in common sense produce nothing save verbal exercises and idle speculations. What warrant is there for the use of pseud-ideas and meaningless phrases?

Prof. J. Paul Williams, in *The Yale Review,* takes the position that belief in a future life "can be accepted as more probable than improbable." Why? Because we all believe that the universe is fundamentally consistent, and that such a universe, which preserves its lowest manifestation—matter—is certainly likely to preserve its highest manifestation—personality. Since personality is the most precious thing we know, the universe would be irrational if it failed to do at least as much for it as it does, according to science, for "a few particles of disordered matter."

Professor Williams admits that for the Atheists, who do not believe in God, a belief in a life after death is clearly irrational. This is, of course, obvious. But he does not even mention the Agnostics, whose number is legion, and who likewise do not believe in immortality for the individual despite the preciousness of human personality. The Agnostic does not deny the existence of God; he simply points out that no human mind can form an idea or image of God. He does not think that a deep mystery is solved or explained by substituting for it a deeper mystery. He is willing, like James, to consider the existence of God as one of several hypotheses, but he cannot find any meaning in this particular hypothesis. To assume the existence of a Supreme Being implies the possession of an intelligible definition of the term "Being." What is the assumed Supreme Being like? No one knows or has the faintest notion. The hypothesis, therefore, cannot be framed or entertained even provisionally. Suppose we say,

with Matthew Arnold, that we believe in "a Power, not ourselves, which makes for righteousness" in human relations. That, too, is only a pure hypothesis and we must require ample evidence to warrant our use of it. But the amount and quality of the requisite evidence on this point need not be considered here. The point is that, *if* there be such a Power—unknowable, inconceivable, inscrutable, in Herbert Spencer's words—then the belief in a life after death is superfluous and gratuitous.

A word about human personality. It is precious, as stated. On this planet, at any rate, it *is* the highest product of evolution. What evolution has brought to other habitable planets—of which there are many, no doubt—we do not know and cannot imagine at present. But we must not overlook the grim fact of Evil in human nature. The moral imbeciles; the creatures in human shape devoid of charity, sympathy, good will; the brutal and vicious war lords or cold-blooded and selfish exploiters, have little, if anything, worth preserving. What sane man hopes that these ugly members of humanity will survive death? The notion of Socrates and Plato that the souls of depraved and evil persons after death invade and take possession of predatory beasts was rational enough, if naive and groundless. In our discussion of immortality, let us not forget the millions who are not morally fit to survive and the thousands whose extinction is a positive blessing. Professor Williams apparently expects *all* human beings to live after death, regardless of their intellectual and moral worth. This is hardly a reasonable expectation or hope, and it is not deducible from the premise.

It may be observed, in passing, that Professor Williams' argument is open to objection, already advanced in another connection, that such phenomena as senility, second childhood, the decline of mental power, the loss of some or all of our faculties in old age, or as the result of certain diseases, severally militate against the contention that a consistent and rational universe cannot destroy human personality at death. We witness such destruction and read or hear about it every day, destruction before death, and apart from death. The glaring facts, therefore, dispose of the argument from rationality in the universe.

Finally, Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, in a little book, entitled *The Hope of Immortality,* argues that if death meant total extinction of the individual, it would amount to "a meaningless interruption," like the lowering of a curtain in the midst of the play. Reason, he declares, rebels against such a conclusion. It dictates, rather, the conclusion that the abundance of life here and now points or guarantees life after what we call death. The present is not sufficient; to make the fullest and best use of it, we require a future. Our hatred of evil and determination to combat and defeat it would not insure our success if our activities were limited to our brief physical span of existence. "Only the extension of life eliminates evil."

Just what does this rhetoric mean? Is evil being fought somehow and in some way unknown to us by disembodied spirits? Or is it the idea that evil persons become decent and honorable by a sort of magic or grace emanating from the pure and noble disembodied spirits? In either case, we are expected to make a violent assumption without a shadow of evidence in support of it. Individual life is limited, and all living things are mortal. But generation succeeds generation; the good work of the dead lives after them; the struggle against evil continues while civilization endures. *Here* is the abundance of life required by Professor Perry. "In the midst of death we are in life." And, as already argued, the finest and highest contributions of men do not die. Bach and Beethoven are not dead. Spinoza is not dead. Dante and Shakespeare are not dead. Evil is fought by books, by art, by science, as well as by living persons. In a sense, therefore, the spirit of man does *not* die. And the spirit is not something that deserts the body at a given moment and finds another habitation and sphere. The spirit lives on in great works, works that speak to us, inspire us, guide us as we face our own tasks and grapple with problems that the ancient or medieval world did not know. Science is progressive and cumulative. The scientist of today stands on the shoulders of his predecessor of yesterday. Technology, the child of science, is also cumulative and progressive. Invention and discovery never take a holiday. Man's curiosity is insatiable.

No; individual immortality in the naive or vulgar sense of the phrase is improbable, even inconceivable. Let us not cry for the moon. Let us live worthily and make the best possible use of our faculties and gifts. The span of life can be and will be lengthened, no doubt. We can count confidently, also, on further successes in the fight on disease, in the effort to render death less painful than it often is, and to make old age more serene, more comfortable. More than that is only wishful thinking, and certainly not rational thinking.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 82)

national relations of the suspicion, distrust and hatred which inevitably result from power threats, boundary violations, secret maneuvering, and violation of public morality; is dependent upon a world leadership *which does not lack the moral courage* to implement the will of the masses who abhor war and upon whom falls the main weight of war's frightful carnage; and, finally, is dependent upon the development of a world order which will permit a nation such as Japan safely to entrust its national integrity to just such a higher law to which all peoples on earth shall render themselves subservient.

Therein lies the road to lasting peace.

I therefore commend Japan's proposal for the renunciation of war to the thoughtful consideration of all the peoples of the world. *It points the way and the only way.* The United Nations Organization, admirable as is its purpose, great and noble as are its aims, can only survive to achieve that purpose and those aims if it accomplishes as to *all nations* just what Japan proposes unilaterally to accomplish through this Constitution—abolish war as a sovereign right.

Such a renunciation must be *simultaneous and universal.* It must be *all* or none. It must be effected by *action*—not words alone—and open, undisguised action which invites the confidence of all men who would serve the cause of peace. . . .

No thoughtful man will fail to recognize that with the development of modern science another war may blast mankind to perdition, but still we hesitate, still we cannot, *despite the yawning abyss at our very feet,* unshackle ourselves from the past. Therein lies the *childlike* faith in the future—a faith that, as in the past, the world can somehow manage to survive yet another universal conflict. In that irresponsible faith *lies civilization's greatest peril.*

We sit here in Council, representatives of the military might and moral strength of the modern world. It is our responsibility and our purpose to consolidate and strengthen the peace won at the staggering cost of war. . . .

—*Fellowship.*

A Doubting Mind Is a Healthy One

JACK MENDELSOHN, JR.

Most of what people have known as organized religion has claimed to be in sole possession of divine revelation and therefore the unimpeachable authority on what should or should not be thought, believed, said, and done. It is this very factor that has given such a powerful position to priesthoods all down through the ages of man's development and evolution.

Almost at once we think, in this regard, of the great and powerful Roman Catholic Church and the marked subservience demanded of the faithful, by its priesthood. There is, for instance, The Index, an ever growing and expanding list of literary pieces which all good Catholics are expressly and vehemently forbidden to peruse, because for one reason or another these works do not satisfy Catholic standards of doctrine or morals. But before we indulge ourselves too wholeheartedly in wholesale condemnation of such a policy, and such a relationship between priest and layman, it would be well to make careful inquiry into that aspect of human endowment which makes priesthoods and other forms of religious totalitarianisms understandable even though not excusable.

All of us are possessed of what William James so aptly termed, "The Will to Believe." To be more explicit, there is woven into the fabric of our humanity a virile urge to feel a certainty and security about things, a desire to sense that matters are within our grasp and that our grasp upon them is both firm and sure.

This will to believe is by no means a late-comer to the family of human faculties. It was, in fact, one of the first products of man's consciousness of himself as a self-motivated individual, and in many remarkable ways it has served him exceedingly well in his climb up the ladder of development. Life has always been filled with its "maybes," with its challenges of as yet unrealized possibilities; and facing these, man has felt constantly the need of weapons with which new victories of progress might be won. One of these weapons has been the psychology of the will to believe, to believe in himself, to believe in his potentialities, to believe in his hidden wells of strength. To return again to William James, we remember his classic example: Suppose, for instance, that you are climbing a mountain, and have worked yourself into a position from which the only escape is by a terrible leap. Have faith that you can successfully make it, and your feet are nerved to its accomplishment. But mistrust yourself, and you will hesitate so long that, at last, all unstrung and trembling, and launching yourself in a moment of despair, you roll in the abyss.

My complaint is not against the healthy functions of man's will to believe, for in truth I would see these functions strengthened. Rather it is against the exploitation of this faculty by wily men in all ages who, in the name of religion, have removed *man* as the object of the will to believe, and substituted instead some wholly external and sacrosanct authority. This distinct perversion of an essentially noble and practical human endowment is nothing new in religious history. It is the story of priestcraft from the medicine man and witch doctor to Calvin's God and the vested Cardinal.

Why does a good Protestant Fundamentalist refuse to recognize the human frailties and inconsistencies of the Bible? For essentially the same reasons given by the Iglulik woman to the explorer Rasmussen when he asked her about the Eskimo priesthood. "We do not all understand the hidden things, but we believe the people who say they do. We believe them because we do not want to face the dangers. We can't take the risk of offending the Spirits."

The symbols may vary with the ages or with the complexity of society, but the content remains the same.

What we really want and need is the opportunity for our will to believe to do its neurologically appointed task of helping us to discover a progressively better way, of helping us to create the fact of the worth-whileness of life. This most desirable mental condition is possible, I am convinced, only when the mind is also armed with the potent weapon of Doubt against the depredations of infallible authorities.

In terms of our desire for greater human self-attainment, what is doubt? Specifically, in an issue like our desire for lasting international peace, what is the function of doubt? Only through our ability to doubt, to question this move or that of the various political, military, and religious "priesthoods," will we ever take the steps necessary to solve the problem of war and peace. We have a strong will to believe in the possibility of peace, to be sure, but unimplemented by healthy doubts and sharply critical questioning we would become easy prey for the wily ones of priestly bent. Nothing is more axiomatic than that "doubt is the handmaiden of truth." Lasting peace is a problem as yet unsolved. The truth which rests at the end of our long quest for peace will not be attained by dogmatisms which exploit our will to believe. And this is but one of a large class of personal and social questions.

In terms of our experience, doubt is what enables us to recognize the real existence of problems which will be settled and solved only by our effort, not by our resignation to "external" forces and to those who lay claim to controlling them.

There is a good measure of satisfaction in realizing that Jesus was a healthy doubter as well as a man of tremendous convictions. Reading between the lines of his evident conflict with the priestly elements of his time, one finds the story of a consciously sympathetic and devoted leader who candidly denied that the great questions of being could be resolved by a professional authority external to man's own inner life. Just as this was a moving and revolutionary religious message in his day, so, too, is it in ours. It is the kind of message that lifts the average imperfect mortal to a new level of dignity atop the twin pedestals of belief in himself and doubt of the infallible. Here is a message, it would seem, worthy of being preached from the housetops. Yet in the name of this selfsame Jesus and in the very face of his challenge, our great ecclesiastical institutions, both Protestant and Catholic alike, continue to dangle before men the seductive bait of an external authority before which man may surrender his dignity and grovel like the depraved worm they declare him to be.

From this standpoint it is indeed a compliment to the intelligence of the American people that the majority of them never take the bait. That the modern American has come to distrust the church as an avenue

of infallible certainty is undeniable. It is also very healthy. But that the average American has totally rectified the perversion of his will to believe in the direction of other kinds of dogmatic, external authorities is a little too much to expect at this early stage of evolution.

No, our struggle for the fruition of greatness in the human soul is very far from complete. We are still afraid of our doubts, as we are still afraid of change. We still grasp at straws, panaceas, cure-alls that require little or none of our own blood, sweat, toil, and tears. We still shrink from that kind of healthy-mindedness which alone can enable us to doubt with determination until a conception is truly proved, or a dream truly realized. The established, authoritarian church is being forsaken, but the task of religion has only begun.

We all feel that our religion should enable us to so integrate ourselves that we become effective and vital forces in the life around us. As Charles Morris has expressed it:

> This is the only kind of religion possible for the great majority of us who can never again "go home" to an old conception, to an old religious absolution, to an old outworn institution which, like the man in Robert Burdette's poem, knows it all.
>
> From East to West, from North to South,
> Who knows all things, both great and small
> And tells it with his tiresome mouth.

When the voice of religion can bring to us a hearty encouragement to cherish our doubts; to revere them as harbingers of future attainment rather than fear them as transgressions against spiritual propriety; to strengthen them as beacons shedding light on the path ahead rather than weakening them as something irreligious and shameful; to look upon them as the advance spearheads of truth: When the voice of religion calls out for this, then and only then will religion be in a position to rescue us from the curse of irresponsibility.

Any party or institution, sacred or secular, which has the audacity to claim possession of the final answers to the problems of human life is a menace to progress. It is a tragedy that such claims, especially in times of tension and uncertainty, are appealing to many and convincing to some. It will cost us something in the eyes of those who accept infallibility in one form or another to posit as a basic tenet of our faith the thesis that a doubting mind is a healthy one. But let us take our assurance in the sobering inward conviction that there is no price too great to pay for intellectual honesty and integrity. If our religion is to be useful to us, surely it must be in these realms. We seek a realization of the wonders harbored in the human breast, but blind faith is not the key to their presence. A reasonable faith in oneself and a healthy doubt of the professedly infallible are the lamps to be lighted and set upon a stand if those who enter to look upon our lives are to see a light.

Want Is the Foe

HERBERT STURGES

John Dewey has called attention to the fact that a stimulus does not immediately and directly cause a response. Each new stimulus enters into an on-going complex of stimulus-response processes. Similarly the "wish," or whatever we call the element of social motivation, does not usually pass directly into behavior seeking its fulfillment. Rather, the wish passes into an already existing set of wish fulfillment processes. Thus current needs, arising under new conditions of life, cannot find immediate satisfaction, since they come into a pre-established system of wish habits. These customary social forms of wish fulfillment pre-exist in the individual, dominate his personality, and usually limit the scope of his responses to his social needs and interests.

Economic needs exist both in individuals and in social groups. The elementary interests of hunger, cold, and loneliness are among the strongest. The fears of want and pain are also powerful motives. "Necessity knows no law." Man will do almost anything to obtain food, shelter, and companionship. Whenever the wish habits develop in scarcity, the true principle of common interest suffers, and the wish habits take the form of exclusive interests. We should combine our resources, plan and work together to satisfy our common needs. Instead, wish habits from the past, conditioned by age-old scarcity, act to produce competition and conflict.

In the struggle for existence, the purposes and wishes of each group dominate its thought and its action. The expression of approval and disapproval is controlled by the exclusive group interests. International morality must ultimately be based on world interests. That is the ethics of coöperation. However, current thinking on world problems is not in terms of world interests, but largely in terms of national interests. In the condition of scarcity, the nations do not pool their material resources and their products, in accordance with the principle of coöperation. Instead of working together to satisfy the common needs of the world community, the nations are dominated by their national wish habits, formed by scarcity. Thus each nation seeks its own interests, which it considers right and just, denouncing the self-seeking of other nations as wrong and unjust.

The sociologist-philosopher Ellwood has shown how, in the conflict among social groups, those groups survive which have the greatest coöperation. Thus, in war between nations, victory may depend on the relative degree of inner unity in the nations. In the struggle between groups, the group which best follows the principle of working together for the common cause is more likely to survive. Thus competition and conflict are selective agencies, with the victory going to coöperation. This is the spiral course of social evolution.

Scarcity prevents the full development of coöperation. Scarcity-induced, exclusive-interest wish habits delay the voluntary growth of social organization. If the world ever becomes united in a coöperative, productive enterprise, scarcity can be replaced by abundance.

Increasing attention to the common interests is one of the means of ending scarcity and conflict. Whenever scarcity can be replaced by plenty, as in a world coöperative commonwealth, the spiral curve of world evolution can be turned into a straight line of social progress.

The Study Table

Behind the Iron Curtain

I CHOSE FREEDOM. *By Victor A. Kravchenko. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 496 pp. $3.50.*

What is life like behind "the iron curtain" which cuts Russia off from her Western Allies? Most discussion of this question is academic because few outsiders penetrate the iron curtain except on conducted tours under the surveillance of secret police.

Victor Kravchenko, former member of the Soviet Purchasing Commission in Washington, has an answer from the inside. Born in Russia in 1905, child of the revolutionary era, he joined the Communist Party in Russia in 1929 and was a member in good standing for seventeen years. He survived the purges. He directed several of the largest metallurgical factories in Russia. Finally, he occupied one of the high-ranking posts in the Kremlin itself.

The picture Kravchenko gives of Russia as he knew it from the inside is terrifying. It grips and haunts the reader. He regards the Soviet system as a totalitarian tyranny which has sold out the common man and established a bureaucratic, privileged class which has even less regard for the masses than the tsars of old. Its goal is state control of all aspects of individual life. Its motive power is stark fear. Its method is ruthless compulsion, aided by torture and death.

I wish that Kravchenko's facts could be refuted, but they have not been as yet. Some Americans speak of "social equality" in Russia. Kravchenko cries in derision, and describes the social distance between the masses and their overseers in Russia as ten times greater than that in the plutocratic United States. Some Americans speak of "economic democracy." Kravchenko describes the system of labor books whereby the worker is bound to his machine more surely than any serf was ever bound to the soil. He describes the millions of slave laborers working under conditions that defy description for pure horror. He describes the system of punishment for lateness at work by which any worker late to work by more than twenty minutes is denounced to the local Prosecutor. In three months one million workers were convicted and sentenced to forced labor in the name of "socialist efficiency."

Kravchenko is astonished at the effectiveness of Soviet propaganda in America. "An incredible thing seemed to have happened in the American mind; the Soviet dictatorship was fully identified with the Russian people. What the Communists had not succeeded in doing in their own country, . . . they had succeeded in doing in America."

One might continue and describe forced labor of children, the rewriting of Russian history in 1938 which he describes as "bold, specious, conscienceless fiction." One could record his pleas for freedom for the poor Russian people, and his constant warning that the Russians are continually told that Americans are the supreme enemies of the Soviet Union.

It may be hard for those who have been thinking wishfully about the Soviet system to believe Kravchenko's story. Let them refute his facts with facts. The *New York Daily Worker's* smear of his book testified to the truth of his record of the long arm of the Soviet system of terror, when it said that "forward-looking humanity catches up with such as him and finally erases them . . . Kravchenko has been living on borrowed time." It behooves those who love freedom and hate despotism to see to it that his freedom is protected and his voice heard.

DONALD HARRINGTON.

Correspondence

Agrees with Chworowsky

To UNITY:

The article in the June issue of UNITY by Karl Chworowsky expresses my sentiments exactly, and I am indeed glad to know that there is someone with enough courage to express such views and a magazine with enough courage to publish them. Too long has the race question been treated with utter infantile stupidity.

Many years ago our ancestors intermarried with the Indians and intermarriage with the Oriental race is not uncommon, and yet no bad effects have been noted from such marriages. On the other hand, inbreeding has had very bad physical and mental results where this has been done.

CHARLES E. GEIGER.

Quakertown, Pennsylvania.

Differs from Chworowsky

To UNITY:

Karl Chworowsky is such a marvelous piano player that he can be forgiven much, even such an article as his "Reflections upon Intermarriage," appearing in the June issue of UNITY. Others are no less concerned than he about the position of the Negro in American life, but not all are convinced that Bilbo's technique of smear and distortion is the best weapon to use against Bilboism.

The scientific aspect of the matter is one where there is an impressive accumulation of data, from Darwin's cross-breeding of pigeons down to the work of such famed geneticists as Crew, Holmes, East, and others. The problem of miscegenation receives extended treatment in the monumental work of Anthony M. Ludovici, *The Choice of a Mate* (London, 1936). What the geneticists have to say about intermarriage and crossbreeding is important in a discussion of this nature, and even Mr. Chworowsky, if he had a little time on his hands and sufficient curiosity, might ascertain the facts and their import.

The social aspect is no less important than the scientific. Half of Chworowsky's article is devoted to vilification and abuse of people with their prejudices, taboos, hypocrisies, and other faults. Yet people are very much what they are, and what they are is a datum of experience of first rate importance. It cannot be wished away, and any scheme for revamping society must come to terms with people as they are and where they are. We no longer think it adequate to dismiss the mentally ill by saying, "There's nothing wrong with you; it's all in your mind." But that is Chworowsky's technique; a thousand words of smear and hatred of people with their shortcomings topped off with a pious reference to human brotherhood and a hope (for which there is no basis in the article) that a modus operandi will be found for intermarriage.

What I found most objectionable in the article was its tone. I object to these dervishes who become drunk with the ghostly wind of human brotherhood, and who, as they whirl, spatter bystanders with their hatred. Chworowsky speaks of "the perversity and hypocrisy of the white man's mind," its "stupidity, arrogance, and dishonesty," without "logic, reasonableness, and decent human considerations," "completely lacking in ordinary intelligence, . . . devoid of historical perspective, . . . utterly ignorant of scientific knowledge and relevant facts, how hopelessly unimaginative and irreligious and shamefully hypocritical he is [when discussing intermarriage]." He speaks of the "antiquated superstition and baseless bias of which the white man's culture carries so ample a stock." He deplores "little minds . . . with their warped viewpoint and their picayune considerations, . . . [haunted by] ancient fears, antiquated prejudices, and outworn mores." With this material to work on he hopes to set everything straight! What a fantastic thing is the Chworowsky mind—and he's such a mild fellow!

Being just an average man and possessing all the frailties enumerated in the preceding paragraph it took me a while to catch on, then I realized that he was talking about me and fifty million other guys named Joe. As spokesman for the group I am authorized to say: "We don't like it!"

EDMUND A. OPITZ.

Worcester, Massachusetts.

Courageous Article

To UNITY:

Mr. Karl M. Chworowsky's article in the June issue of UNITY is the first forthright, utterly courageous, and truthful article on intermarriage that I have seen, written by a white person not himself married to a Negro.

I am grateful to Mr. Chworowsky for writing the article and to UNITY for publishing it.

When adults tell me that the chances for happiness in an interracial marriage are small and that such a marriage is not fair to the children, I reply that it is my responsibility to try to help create a condition of society in which people who wish to marry interracially and their children *can* have a reasonable chance of happiness.

The June issue of UNITY appears to me to be particularly rich and vigorous. Without doubt, the Unitarian fellowship is becoming a leading, pioneering group in the movement for democracy in many phases. I am not a Unitarian. But reading UNITY and *The Humanist* wins from me an increasing respect for Unitarianism.

EDITH HANSEN.

Upper Darby, Pennsylvania.

Advance

To UNITY:

Congratulations on the June editorial in UNITY on the Advance Movement among Unitarians. It is a very fine and well-tempered statement.

STEPHEN H. FRITCHMAN,
Editor, *Christian Register.*

Boston, Massachusetts.

A Thoughtful Response

To UNITY:

The editorial in the June issue of UNITY contains implications that do not seem clear, and I am seeking light. First of all, the Editor says: "The Advance Movement among Unitarians could make much more rapid progress if a small minority would come to understand that the genius of Unitarian history and the temper of Unitarianism today are definitely in accord with the free mind principle."

Who and what is this "small minority" that is referred to? What are their tenets, and in what respects are they not in accord "with the free mind principle"? I am asking myself: Am I personally to be included in this classification? The Editor refers to an attempt "to convert the Unitarian movement into a Christian sect." Presumably he has in mind the Christian Unitarians as sponsors of this attempt, and I am frankly willing to acknowledge the name of Christian. I, too, am among those who have changed their minds, for in my youth I served orthodox churches, and I became a Unitarian in middle life, but I still call myself a Christian, for both during my orthodoxy and during the time of my Unitarianism it has been my sincere endeavor to live, work, think, and speak in the spirit of the life and teachings of Jesus. In that I have not changed. If it is necessary to cite an example to show that this position is not at all foreign to Unitarian tradition, I need only mention William Ellery Channing, who was a Christian if there ever was one.

Again the Editor says: "The only possible way for a church of the free mind to get along harmoniously is for its members and especially its clergy to take the free mind principle seriously, and not be disturbed over differences in theological opinions." I can speak only for myself, and I am not disturbed over theological differences. He mentions several groups, all of whom are entitled to the same rights and privileges—the same, but no more: Christian Unitarians, yes, you may count me as one of them; Theist Unitarians, yes, I am a thoroughgoing Theist; Humanist Unitarians, yes, I accept every human interest and value as set forth in any Humanist philosophy that I know anything about—as far as it goes. There is not a word in Francis G. Ricker's *Five Bases of Unitarian Advance* that I do not accept. What I do object to is that this statement fails to include the positive convictions and passionate interests, be they Theist or Humanist, which constitute the most vital part of our thinking, and which must furnish the heat and the motive power of Unitarian Advance, or there will be no advance. The free mind principle by all means, but that principle finds poor expression in statements so diluted that they omit everything that can be called controversial. It is far more to the point to have each group come forward and contribute its own richest thought and profoundest convictions. I respect an honest, positive Humanist statement. I respect an honest, positive Theistic statement. Let us all come forward with the best we have to offer, and let such audiences as we may reach make their own decisions.

One point in the editorial puzzles me particularly. Christian, Theist, and Humanist Unitarians are mentioned as having the same rights and privileges. There is no mention of the Cosmotheistic group, but I suppose they would be included, for certainly they belong. But there is one strange exclusion: "The remnants of a discredited Pantheism should not find their way to a new vogue through the unguarded back door of humanistic mysticism." Why this exception to our tolerance? I do not know if there is a single Pantheist in our fellowship, but if there is one, the principle of the free mind includes him.

And now an additional word of comment on the frequency with which the free mind principle is stressed in so many of our discussions. The free mind is essential, and I believe in it unmistakably. But it is nothing more than a vessel, and what is important is its content. It means little unless it contains a sense of duty and responsibility, a willingness to stand for a just but unpopular cause, and the practice of those moral principles that stand out above the common run of conduct. Too many of us regard freedom as the right to do what we please. There are limitations. A man is not free to violate his conscience; he is not free to say what he knows to be untrue; he is not free to avoid a duty. He is free to do what he ought!

Our classic definition of the free mind principle comes, of course, from Channing, but we are inclined to overlook that part of his definition that leaves no doubt as to the claims of duty, responsibility, conscience, and moral law. With Channing freedom and responsibility, the free mind and conscience, are inseparable. Bring these joint principles home to the attention of people, and persuade them to think and live and work in the spirit of their demand,—then we shall see Unitarian Advance.

CHARLES G. GIRELIUS.

Barneveld, New York.

Approval

To UNITY:

I want to tell you of my interest and pleasure in reading the editorial, "The Role of America in World Affairs," in the July number of UNITY. The concept of a United States of the World is the same type of rare thinking and feeling that guided the founding fathers in 1787. More power to you! Also I think the contents of UNITY are better than ever.

JAMES A. MEADE.

Iowa City, Iowa.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

UNITED APPEAL FINALS

The final returns on what the churches of the Western Unitarian Conference did on the United Appeal have been received. The total figures are:

Church Quotas	$25,420.00
Church Contributions	25,476.17
Special Events and Gifts	6,872.53
Total Conference Contribution	$32,348.70

This is the best record the Conference has made. Congratulations go to those churches and people who worked so hard to make it a success. Sixty per cent of our churches made or exceeded their quotas, some of them going over one hundred per cent or more. Special recognition should be given to the following churches as they exceeded their quotas by at least ninety per cent.

Alton, Illinois.
Evanston, Illinois.
Grosse Pointe, Michigan.
Hobart, Indiana.
Indianapolis, Indiana.
Iowa City, Iowa.
Lincoln, Nebraska.
Omaha, Nebraska.
St. Louis, Missouri.
St. Paul, Minnesota.

Churches which made or exceeded their quotas are:

Alton, Illinois.
Angora, Minnesota.
Ann Arbor, Michigan.
Chicago—Beverly
Chicago—Third Church.
Cincinnati—First Church.
Colorado Springs, Colorado.
Davenport, Iowa.
Dayton, Ohio.
Denver, Colorado.
Des Moines, Iowa.
Evanston, Illinois.
Ft. Wayne, Indiana.
Geneseo, Illinois.
Geneva, Illinois.
Grosse Pointe, Michigan.
Hanska, Minnesota.
Hinsdale, Illinois.
Hobart, Indiana.
Humboldt, Iowa.
Indianapolis, Indiana.
Iowa City, Iowa.
Jackson, Michigan.
Kalamazoo, Michigan.
Kansas City, Missouri.
Keokuk, Iowa.
Lincoln, Nebraska.
Louisville—Clifton Church.
Madison, Wisconsin.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin.
Moline, Illinois.
Omaha, Nebraska.
St. Louis, Missouri.
St. Paul, Minnesota.
Salina, Kansas.
Shelbyville, Illinois.
Toledo, Ohio.
Underwood, Minnesota.
Urbana, Illinois.
Willmar, Minnesota.

POLITICAL NOTE

It will be of interest to many Unitarians throughout the Midwest that Mrs. Martha Sharp was nominated to run for Congress in the Democratic Primaries in Massachusetts last June. Mrs. Sharp will have as her Republican opponent Representative Martin, minority leader of the House of Representatives. During last fall she spoke in several Midwestern communities for the National War Fund and for the Czechoslovakian Relief. Rev. and Mrs. Waitstill Sharp were among the earliest representatives of the Unitarian Service Committee in Europe.

ARTHUR GRAHAM

Rev. Arthur Graham, who for the past four months has been the interim minister at Sioux City, Iowa, has resigned to accept a position with the Public Relations Department of the Government of Puerto Rico. Mr. Graham while in the United States Army spent two years in Puerto Rico as chaplain of Puerto Rican troops.

BOOKS AND SUPPLIES

Curriculum materials and church school supplies should be ordered now to insure prompt service. The Conference Office has the complete Beacon Press Series and the materials recommended by the Division of Education. We carry some other materials as well, and can furnish your needs. We have ready access to many publishers, and what we do not have in stock can be obtained with ease and dispatch. Patronize the Western Unitarian Conference Book Department.

Of current interest are the following:

Beyond Doubt, by Kenneth Patton. $2.50.
Faith of an Unrepentant Liberal, by A. Powell Davies. $1.00.
Humanism States Its Case, by J. A. C. F. Auer. (Paper bound.) $1.00.
History of Unitarianism, Vol. I, by Earl Morse Wilbur. $6.00.
The Meaning of Humanism, by Curtis W. Reese. $1.00.
If Thought Be Free, by E. Burdette Backus. $1.00.
What Can One Believe?, by Arthur Olsen. $1.00.
Peace of Mind, by Joshua Loth Liebman. $2.50.
The Impact of Psychology, by E. Burdette Backus. Fifteen Cents.
Faith in the Making, by Harry C. Meserve. Twenty-five Cents.
Three Unitarian Philosophies of Religion, by R. Lester Mondale. Twenty-five Cents.
Earth Could Be Fair, by Pierre van Paassen. $3.75.
Public Relations for Churches, by Stewart Harral. $1.00.